DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 627 EC 080 176

TITLE	Educating the Gifted in California Schools. Part I: Plan for the Education of Gifted Individuals in California Schools. Part II: Report of the Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted.
INSTITUTION	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	39p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Bureau of Publications Sales, California State Department of Education, P. O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 95802 ($1.25)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Policy; Administrator Role; *Curriculum Design; Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Education; Financial Support; *Gifted; Legislation; *Program Planning; Staff Improvement; State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS	California

ABSTRACT

Presented is a 2-part report on educating the gifted in California schools. Included in Part One on program planning are brief sections on goals, proposed legislation, the role of the Gifted and Talented Education Management Team, a 3-phase proposal for implementing work plans (in such areas as management, preservice and inservice training, research and evaluation), and experimental programs for gifted disadvantaged students. Considered in Part Two are portions of a Blue Ribbon Committee report that deal with general philosophy; a definition of gifted individuals (in terms of intellectual, leadership, and creative abilities); major program goals; basic needs (including multiple learning options); program principles in the areas of counseling, curriculum design, and staff development; and program recommendations regarding aspects such as evaluation, individualized instruction, parental involvement, funding, and staffing ratios. Provided is a chart relating program principles and recommendations; and appended are lists of Blue Ribbon Committee, planning team, and Department of Education staff members. (LH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED112627

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Educating the Gifted in California Schools

Part One: Plan for the Education of Gifted Individuals in California Schools

Part Two: Report of the Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted

EC080176

This publication was edited and prepared for photo-offset production by the Bureau of Publications, California State Department of Education, and published by the Department, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814.

Printed by the Office of State Printing
and distributed under the provisions
of the Library Distribution Act

1975

Copies of this publication may be purchased from the Bureau of Publications Sales, California State Department of Education, P.O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 95802, at a price of $1.25 per copy, plus 7 cents sales tax for California residents.

Reprinted by the
Los Angeles Unified
School District

Foreword

When I addressed the Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted at its first session in October, 1973, I asked that group to consider the fundamental educational needs of the gifted and to determine what the public schools should do to meet these needs. A comprehensive review of the needs of the gifted was long overdue. Since 1961, when programs for mentally gifted students were first funded by the State of California, professional educators and parents alike have questioned whether the needs of gifted programs were being adequately identified, assessed, and met.

Specifically, I asked the committee

- To decide on a working definition of *gifted*
- To identify the unique educational needs of that defined group
- To recommend how the needs of the defined group could best be met

The Blue Ribbon Committee did an admirable job in responding to my request. After receiving the committee's report in the spring of 1974, I asked a departmentwide planning committee to draft a plan for the education of the gifted in California, using the report of the Blue Ribbon Committee as a springboard. The document prepared by the planning committee, the "Plan for the Education of Gifted Individuals in California Schools," represents Part One of this publication. Part Two contains portions of the report of the Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted.

Thus, in this one publication, the Department of Education presents two closely related documents, both providing direction to future Department of Education efforts in gifted child education.

The committees which developed the material contained in this publication emphasize the fact that gifted students are not devoid of fundamental needs; they, too, need to be taught and guided and their special needs met. They will not necessarily "make it on their own." Results of research conducted over the past 50 years show that gifted youth who have little or no direction often scatter their gifts and waste their powers. Thus, the talents of many of them are often lost to society and to themselves.

Our responsibility is to help gifted children move with strength and insight toward realizing their potential. If we fail to do this, our society will suffer in incalculable ways.

Superintendent of Public Instruction

Preface

At the request of Wilson Riles, Superintendent of Public Instruction, a broadly representative Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted met during the fall and winter of 1973-74. The committee reviewed research findings and California's record of 12 years of successful programming for gifted education as they focused on the current needs of gifted and talented individuals in California's schools. It was recognized that the gifted frequently have been misunderstood and educationally malnourished in an educational system intended for full intellectual and creative development of each individual.

The "Plan for the Education of Gifted Individuals in California Schools," contained in this publication, incorporates most of the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee. The plan is intended as a guide for reconceptualizing and building an even better statewide program for the gifted.

With appreciation expressed to members of the Blue Ribbon Committee, members of a departmental planning team, and to many educators and other interested citizens, the Department of Education begins the task of further refining and making necessary administrative provisions to implement components of the "Plan for the Education of Gifted Individuals in California Schools."

WILLIAM E. WEBSTER
Deputy Superintendent
for Programs

SIEG EFKEN
Manager, Gifted and
Talented Education Management Team

Contents

Foreword iii
Preface v
INTRODUCTION 1

PART ONE: PLAN FOR THE EDUCATION OF GIFTED INDIVIDUALS IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS .. 3

Underlying Philosophy for the Gifted Plan 5
Goals for the Gifted Program 5
Implementation Plan for the Education of the Gifted 6
Proposed Legislation Needed to Improve the Program 6
Eligibility for Gifted Programs 6
Unserved Gifted Individuals 7
Education Code Waiver 7
Inservice Training 7
Community Involvement 7
Mandated Programs 7
Role of the Management Team 8
Departmentwide Involvement 8
Intradepartmental Advisory Committee 9
Proposed Work Plan for State Department of Education 9
Phase I of the Work Plan for Gifted Education 10
Phase II of the Work Plan for Gifted Education 13
Phase III of the Work Plan for Gifted Education 14
Statewide Inservice Training Model 14
Experimental Programs for the Mentally Gifted 15
Educationally Disadvantaged Students 16
Talent Development 18

PART TWO: REPORT OF THE BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION OF THE GIFTED ... 21

Philosophy 21
Definition 21
Goals 22
Needs 22
Program Principles 22
Program Recommendations 23
General Recommendations 23
Specific Recommendations to the State Department of Education 24

Figure 1—Cross-reference grid showing relationship of program principles and program recommendations for education of gifted individuals in California 26

APPENDIX

Members, Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted .. 31
State Department of Education Staff to the Blue Ribbon Committee 32
Members, State Department of Education Planning Team on Gifted Education 32

Introduction

California inaugurated a program for mentally gifted students in 1961 when the Legislature provided for Special Educational Programs for Mentally Gifted Minors (Education Code sections 6421–6434). Although California has taken a leading position nationally in implementing special programs to meet the unique needs of the gifted, questions and concerns have still been raised regarding the most appropriate methods for providing programs for gifted students. These concerns, along with the rapid increase in the number of children being served, indicated in the fall of 1973 that a comprehensive review was needed.

In response to the concerns, Superintendent of Public Instruction Wilson Riles appointed a blue ribbon committee to advise him on ways of improving education for gifted children. That committee—the Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted—first met on October 24, 1973. Deliberations were completed at a meeting in Sacramento on February 14, 1974. Shortly thereafter the committee made its report to Superintendent Riles.

The Superintendent and his Executive Cabinet gave careful consideration to the committee's recommendations, which ranged broadly from general suggestions related to special and individual programs for the gifted to specific suggestions about preservice and inservice training for teachers.

In addition to preparing the report and making recommendations, the Blue Ribbon Committee sent a letter to the Superintendent expressing the committee's belief that the gifted program should remain a part of the Master Plan for Special Education if certain changes were made. After careful consideration by the Superintendent and the Executive Cabinet, it was decided that the needs of the gifted and other individuals with exceptional needs (coming under the domain of special education) could best be served if the gifted program were implemented separate from the Master Plan for Special Education.

Accordingly, the Superintendent directed Department of Education staff members to (1) prepare appropriate legislation; and (2) develop an action plan for improvement of education for the gifted.

The Deputy Superintendent for Programs was given the responsibility of establishing a planning team for this new effort. Twelve staff members from the Department of Education, representing a broad

range of expertise and experience and cutting across all units in the Department, were selected to serve on the planning team.

The planning team's mission was twofold: (1) to develop objectives to be implemented by a Gifted and Talented Education Management Team; and (2) to determine the composition, goals, and responsibility of the management team. The material developed by the planning team is presented as part one of this document.

Thoughtful consideration was given to the "Report of the Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted," especially the section containing recommendations. That section, as well as other materials from the report of the committee, are presented in the second part of this document. Sections on philosophy, definition, goals, and needs, as well as a graphic illustration on the relationship between program principles and recommendations, are included. All of the information presented by the Blue Ribbon Committee in its report to the Superintendent will be used by the management team as it continues to implement the program for gifted and talented education.

Significant contributions to the work of the planning team were also made by the Bureau for Mentally Exceptional Children in the Department of Education and by the staffs responsible for the gifted programs that currently exist in the state.

Part One:
Plan for the Education of Gifted Individuals in California Schools

Since the beginning of California's mentally gifted minor program in 1961, pupil participation has grown from 35,000 to an estimated 184,000 students (full-time equivalent) in the 1974-75 fiscal year. The average increase in participation per year since 1962-63 has been 7 percent. However, during 1972-73 there was a 29 percent increase; during 1973-74 there was a 17 percent increase.

School district participation has grown from 188 districts during the first year (1961-62) to 280 districts during 1973-74. (It is estimated that of the state's 1,054 school districts, the 280 districts which participated in the gifted program in 1973-74 enrolled approximately 90 percent of the state's total pupil population.)

Many school districts have never participated in the program nor attempted to identify gifted individuals.

Funding for the mentally gifted minor program has been uneven and uncertain. Although a three-year research study (1957–1960) conducted by the State Department of Education and financed by the California State Legislature clearly showed the need for allocating about $250 per year for each pupil in a mentally gifted minor program, the initial funding level was established at $40 (which was intended to include both identification and program costs). In 1967 the funding level was raised for one year only to $60 for program expenses and $40 for identification expenses. Two years later, the funding was established at that rate: $60 for extra program expenses for each identified mentally gifted minor and $40 for each child identified. Legislation passed in 1972 increased the special identification allowance from $40 to $50 and provided for special progressive program allowance increases of $10 per year through 1975-76, as follows:

Allowance	*Year*
$70	1972-73
$80	1973-74
$90	1974-75
$100	1975-76 and thereafter

Total expenditures for gifted program and identification costs in 1972-73 and 1973-74 were as follows:

Year	*Amount*
1972-73	$11,890,202
1973-74	$15,600,000

The Department of Education's Bureau of School Apportionments and Reports has estimated that total program and identification costs in 1974-75 and 1975-76 will be:

Year	*Amount*
1974-75	$18,095,400
1975-76	$19,244,000

Currently, the statewide apportionments formula is limited to funds based upon 3 percent of the units of average daily attendance (a.d.a.) of the previous fiscal year. For 1972-73 five out of 29 high school districts had identified and served over 3 percent of their a.d.a. as mentally gifted minors; 56 of 99 elementary school districts served over 3 percent; and 57 of 112 unified school districts served over 3 percent. Thus, 49 percent (118) of the 240 districts reporting served over 3 percent of their a.d.a. as identified mentally gifted minors. Of these 118 school districts with more than 3 percent identified as gifted, 28 districts (19 elementary districts and nine unified districts but no high school districts) had over 10 percent of their pupil population identified and participating as mentally gifted minors.

Although there were dramatic increases in the percentage of educationally disadvantaged children participating in programs for mentally gifted minors since 1969 and although there were significant increases in the number of school districts offering programs for these children, in 1972-73 only 7,485 disadvantaged, underachieving mentally gifted minors participated in the program; the total pupil participation for that year was 143,000. Thus, only 5 percent of the identified gifted are in the educationally disadvantaged, underachieving population.

It is obvious that a more equitable and manageable funding formula must be developed for obtaining and utilizing resources so that school districts can identify and serve as many of the educationally disadvantaged population as possible.

The recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted point out the following needs:

- To redefine and more adequately identify the gifted, particularly the gifted in the disadvantaged population
- To ensure that programs are provided for all defined gifted
- To provide more adequate funding
- To protect against overidentification or program planning based on overanticipation of available funds
- To ensure program quality that will meet the unique needs of the gifted

Underlying Philosophy for the Gifted Plan

The development of the Department of Education Plan for Gifted Education is based on the following philosophy developed by the planning team as background for the plan to which the management team will be responsive:

Differences among individual students are great. The central task of the schools is to facilitate the continuous educational progress of each pupil by identifying the significant differences among learners and differentiating expectancies for them while promoting maximum growth. In carrying out this responsibility, the public schools in California are concerned with the education of each child, recognizing the needs of those with outstanding ability and potential for superior achievement in intellectual, creative, and leadership activities.

Although much has been accomplished, we must continue to answer the question of how best to cultivate giftedness within the structure of education for everyone. No culture can afford to waste precious human resources. Programs must be designed which adequately identify and motivate gifted individuals and allow for their maximum development. The intellectual processes by which the gifted assimilate knowledge and make the necessary accommodations to this new knowledge are unique and must be taken into consideration. Parents, school personnel, and other community representatives meeting together must study, discuss, and arrive at a consensus on these and other issues. Their consensus can then contribute to the framework for local programs.

The emergence and development of talent cannot be left to chance.

Goals for the Gifted Program

Based on the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee, the Department has set the following goals for its gifted program:

- To expand the definition of *gifted* to include the areas of creativity and leadership as well as those measures related more directly to general intellectual capacity
- To pursue with greater vigor the identification of and programming for gifted individuals who are among the culturally different student population
- To coordinate statewide inservice training to increase the awareness and understanding of giftedness by school board members, administrators, teachers, parents, and other appropriate publics
- To coordinate statewide inservice training to upgrade the quality of the teaching of gifted individuals

- To establish experimental programs for the gifted
- To improve the quality of programs for gifted individuals statewide
- To increase the level of state support for programs for the gifted

Implementation Plan for the Education of the Gifted

The Plan for the Education of Gifted Individuals in California Schools is being implemented by the Gifted and Talented Education Management Team, State Department of Education. The management team is charged with the responsibility of pursuing stated objectives. These objectives lie in four areas: (1) management; (2) training; (3) planning; and (4) research and evaluation. Three phases of implementation are superimposed over the time line; detailed objectives will be developed during phases I and II. Phase I and the initial stages of Phase II will focus on providing inservice training programs and developing and implementing experimental programs. The time line and description of the work plan begin on page 10.

Proposed Legislation Needed to Improve the Program

In addition to the administrative actions which the Department has initiated to improve the quality of educational programs for gifted individuals, legislative action is required to correct certain current problems and to set a course for long-term improvement of the program.

Legislative action will address itself to the issues of eligibility, unserved gifted, inservice training, waiver of the Education Code in certain instances, and mandated programs.

Eligibility for Gifted Programs

The law currently limits those who can participate in programs to individual students who (1) are in the top 2 percent of the pupil population in the state; (2) demonstrate high achievement in schoolwork; (3) are, in the judgment of teachers, administrators, and supervisors, persons who indicate superior potential; and (4) have demonstrated general intellectual capacity but for reasons associated with cultural disadvantages[1] have underachieved scholastically.

The application of the present criteria has resulted in 3.7 percent of the pupils in the state being identified as gifted and being served in programs for the gifted. The apportionments formula limits the

[1] This reference and any subsequent reference to cultural or culturally disadvantaged is used because it was recognized as appropriate at the time the law was enacted. However, the Department no longer recognizes the term as an appropriate description and accepts in its place *culturally different* and *educationally disadvantaged*.

payment of existing allowances to 3 percent of statewide average daily attendance (a.d.a.). This has resulted in proration of funds to districts after they have identified and served children in a given school year.

Current legislation will recommend that support be increased to 4 percent of a.d.a. to reflect the actual current need.

Unserved Gifted Individuals

There are individuals who could benefit substantially from educational programs for the gifted but because of the current definitions are excluded. The most significant of these, as identified by the Blue Ribbon Committee, are the potential leaders and the highly creative. The legislation will recommend funds for an experimental program to be organized to develop criteria for the identification of such individuals. Appropriate educational programs will then be developed to meet the special needs of these students.

Education Code Waiver

In a limited number of cases, the provisions of the Education Code hamper the development of innovative and creative ways to meet the needs of gifted individuals. In such cases the State Board of Education should be given the authority to waive these provisions when the failure to do so would hinder programs for the gifted. This authority is included in the new legislation.

Inservice Training

The report of the Blue Ribbon Committee strongly emphasizes the need for a systematic statewide inservice training program to assist school personnel in upgrading their local programs. Current state legislation recognizes this need and requests state financial assistance for the Department of Education to organize and provide such a program.

Community Involvement

Parents of gifted children should be involved in the process of educational policy making at the local level. Programs should represent a communitywide response rather than simply a categorical program. Although response to this need requires more than legislation, any appropriately established district or school advisory committee will be expected to have parents of the gifted represented.

Mandated Programs

Because gifted programs are optional at the local level, only 25 percent of the districts in the state are providing programs for the

gifted. (However, as previously noted, these districts enroll approximately 90 percent of the state's total pupil population.)

The Blue Ribbon Committee recommended and the State Department of Education agrees that programs should be mandated. However, to ensure sufficient understanding and acceptance of the unique needs of the gifted and to develop quality programs to meet those needs, the time for making the programs mandatory should be sufficiently in the future to ensure the proper level of advanced planning and staff development.

Role of the Management Team

To ensure that the new emphasis in education for gifted individuals will receive appropriate attention and high visibility, the Gifted and Talented Education Management Team has been formed to concentrate on this effort for at least three years. At the end of that time, consideration will be given to the program's permanent placement in the Department.

In its high visibility period, the management team will conduct regional training workshops for inservice education, develop experimental programs, and assist districts to improve the quality and quantity of their offerings as financial support is increased and as the state moves toward mandatory programs for the gifted. The completion of some of these activities is contingent upon the passage of pending legislation.

Operating under the direction of the Deputy Superintendent for Programs, the management team will be responsible for management, training, planning, and evaluation, as well as the development of research related to education for the gifted. In the process, provisions will be made for ongoing maintenance or revision of programs and procedures already developed and the development of policy, programs, and services not previously encompassed because of limited resources.

Departmentwide Involvement

The management team will assume the responsibility of coordination with other state and federal programs. Within the Department, this responsibility will include reviewing materials, directives, guidelines, and the like to ensure that the following programs include an awareness of and compatibility with the thrust for education of the gifted:

Early childhood education (ECE). It is recognized that all schools with ECE programs should be working toward meeting the needs of the gifted through the requirement of individualization of instruction based on individual assessment.

Compensatory education. Recognition of the underachieving gifted students who can be served by compensatory education and the potential for assistance needs to be addressed.

Vocational and career education. Talent development is important in and to vocational and career education, which have access to resources and a rationale for working cooperatively in the talent development area.

General education. The resources of general education need to be utilized in any comprehensive program.

Child development programs. Early identification and parent counseling should begin with these programs.

Fine arts and humanities. There is natural relationship between the fine arts and humanities and the development of extraordinary talent.

Intradepartmental Advisory Committee

The work of the management team, particularly as it relates to coordination with other programs, will be enhanced by the continuation of the present planning team as an in-house advisory committee. This committee may be called upon intermittently to react to plans, serve as a sounding board, and assist in the interpretation of the functions of the management team throughout the Department and the state as the committee members carry out their distinct Department assignments.

Proposed Work Plan for State Department of Education

The following work plan establishes the objectives that the Department of Education will follow in implementing the Plan for the Education of Gifted Individuals in California Schools. It should be noted that the objectives are consistent with Department of Education approved goals and subgoals. Some of the goals and subgoals that this plan addresses and which need to be differentiated with appropriate performance criteria are the following:

1. Providing greater individualization of instruction and diversity of programs, relevant to identified student and societal needs
2. Providing opportunities for all students to express their creativity and to develop their individual talents and aptitudes
3. Providing opportunities and experiences which help students develop their abilities and interests in a wide range of leisure-time activities—physical, intellectual, and creative
4. Developing dissemination capabilities as needed to promote the use of validated educational practices, planning processes, and administrative methods and to facilitate communication both among educators and between educators and the public

5. Obtaining and allocating resources to local and intermediate educational agencies in ways that ensure that they will obtain all resources to which they are entitled and can compete for all resources for which they are eligible
6. Performing and sponsoring research to develop new programs and structures that will effectively meet the needs of students and of society
7. Setting of standards and providing inservice training to ensure that all Department personnel are of the highest quality and have the skills required for devising and implementing effective solution strategies for existing and emerging educational problems

In developing this plan, the planning team considered the recommendations made by the Blue Ribbon Committee, existing gifted programs throughout California, the tremendous array of materials developed by Department of Education consultants in the area of the gifted, information from members of organizations made up of parents of the gifted, and school district personnel who represent gifted programs. The planning team, representing various units in the Department, developed the following work plan for the Gifted and Talented Education Management Team.

Phase I of the Work Plan for Gifted Education

Management-related Objectives Directly Affecting the Department of Education

1. Interface the gifted program with other Department of Education units in an attempt to increase understanding of the program and cooperatively achieve common objectives.
2. Train additional staff in the Department to assist in carrying out the management team objectives.

Management-related Objectives Directly Affecting the Field

1. Review and approve applications for funding for gifted programs.
2. Serve as liaison between the Department and school districts and parent organizations.
3. Promote gifted education and make the program visible in the Department and at the local level through the involvment of parents and other citizens of the community.
4. Provide technical assistance and consultant and fiscal support to local educational agencies.

5. Report and disseminate timely and appropriate information regarding gifted education to local educational agencies, the Legislature, the Department of Education, and others.
6. Develop, interpret, and support legislation.
7. Develop criteria for project applications for establishing experimental programs for gifted pupils.
8. Refine and interpret the new definition for the gifted based on the Blue Ribbon Committee's recommendation (including the talented and the disadvantaged).
9. Implement new legislation.
10. Identify and develop model high visibility programs in the areas of career preparation, work experience and dropout prevention, talent development, and the California Summer Honors Program, to include the following.

    ECE–Gifted
    Disadvantaged–Gifted
    Physically handicapped–Gifted
    Communicatively handicapped–Gifted
11. Assist districts to prepare for future mandated gifted programs.
12. Prepare guidelines for the implementation of objectives by the management team.
13. Monitor and audit gifted programs to ensure quality educational programs uniquely appropriate for the gifted.

Training-related Objectives Directly Affecting the Department of Education

1. Develop preservice training models to provide preservice training to the management team members and other Department of Education staff.
2. Develop inservice training models to provide inservice training to appropriate Department staff.

Training-related Objectives Directly Affecting the Field

1. Develop preservice training models to provide preservice training to prospective teachers of the gifted, prospective administrators of gifted programs, and prospective consultants for gifted programs.
2. Develop inservice training models to provide inservice training to the following:

County, district, and school level administrators
Teachers in gifted programs
Program evaluators
Program developers
School counselors
Program consultants
Program coordinators
Parents
Members of the community

3. Utilize existing resource centers to disseminate information to the field.
4. Establish a cooperative relationship with teacher training institutions to improve the preparation of teachers of gifted pupils.

Planning-related Objectives Directly Affecting the Department of Education

1. Prepare pertinent materials regarding gifted programs for Department staff.
2. Develop strategies for involving appropriate Department staff in the development and implementation of gifted programs.

Planning-related Objectives Directly Affecting the Field

1. Develop pertinent materials regarding gifted programs.
2. Disseminate new materials in areas such as the following:
   - Leadership and creativity
   - Administration of gifted programs
   - Education of the disadvantaged
   - Career education
   - Work experience and dropout prevention
   - Education for the educationally and physically handicapped
   - Migrant education
   - Appropriate staffing ratios in relation to needs for the gifted
   - Parent counseling
3. Develop strategies for parent counseling, parent education, and parent involvement.
4. Develop strategies for involving the community in planning, conducting, and evaluating program provisions.
5. Provide leadership in the development of program options for the gifted who are educationally disadvantaged.

6. Explore cooperatively with postsecondary institutions the inclusion of academic and other programs uniquely appropriate for the gifted.
7. Seek grants from the federal government to provide a broader funding source.
8. Seek and develop funding grants from foundations.

Research and Evaluation-related Objectives Directly Affecting the Field

1. Encourage and support Department of Education research to be used as the foundation of program development and validation of gifted program methods, procedures, and instructional strategies.
2. Build a comprehensive evaluation system that will include random sample program and fiscal audits.
3. Support departmental efforts in action research regarding the gifted.

The major emphasis in the first phase of the work plan will be on a comprehensive, in-depth inservice education program and the establishment of experimental programs while maintaining the necessary functions of project review and approval.

Phase II of the Work Plan for Gifted Education

The objectives stated for the first phase are still valid for the second phase. However, the following additional objectives will be implemented in the second phase.

Management-related Objectives Directly Affecting the Department of Education

1. Transfer appropriate gifted program development functions to other units in the Department responsible for those functions.
2. Transfer appropriate program review and approval functions to other units in the Department responsible for those functions.

Management-related Objectives Directly Affecting the Field

1. Support needed legislation appropriate for gifted students.
2. Implement the introduction of mandatory programs if legislated.
3. Utilize alternative funding sources to establish (a) centers for resources and inservice training; and (b) demonstration and

development centers for gifted students who are educationally disadvantaged.

4. Develop guidelines for future programs for the gifted that will incorporate the expanded definition of giftedness and appropriate findings from the experimental programs.

Training-related Objectives Directly Affecting the Department of Education

1. Provide training to members of appropriate Department units regarding gifted program development.
2. Provide training to members of appropriate Department units regarding gifted program review and approval.

Research and Evaluation-related Objectives Directly Affecting the Field

1. Cooperate with established centers for research and inservice training.
2. Disseminate findings from the various experimental programs.
3. Utilize Department of Education research on education of the gifted to assist in planning and developing gifted programs.

Phase III of the Work Plan for Gifted Education

At the end of the second phase of implementation of the plan for gifted education, there will be a review to determine future organizational placement of the program in the Department. Regardless of where the program is placed organizationally, there will be a continuing need to pursue the goals, to evaluate the objectives and outcomes of the first two phases of high visibility thrust, and to continue to develop new objectives.

Statewide Inservice Training Model

It is apparent that providing educational opportunities to gifted children will require supplementing the training of those people who have either a direct or indirect influence on gifted youngsters. With this in mind, great emphasis will be placed on a statewide inservice training program for those people in the Department of Education and in the field who in some way relate to programs for the gifted.

The following persons within the Department of Education will be involved in the inservice training program: members of the Gifted and Talented Education Management Team; representatives from the

Early Childhood Education program, Compensatory Education Unit, Career Education Unit, Vocational Education Unit, and Bilingual-Bicultural Task Force; and other appropriate Department staff members.

Persons involved from the field will include school district governing board members, administrators, teachers of the gifted, coordinators of and consultants for gifted programs, school counselors, psychologists and psychometrists, parents of gifted children, and other appropriate members of the community. Participants will be selected from the school district, and county levels.

The content of the inservice training sessions will vary depending on the audiences involved but will include the following elements: orientation to the new gifted plan; awareness, motivation, and acceptance of gifted programs; future considerations regarding mandatory programs; creativity and leadership; sound programming principles; information on exemplary gifted programs; improved knowledge and skills; instructional methodologies; uniquely appropriate activities; and assessment procedures.

The training team will be composed of members of the Gifted and Talented Education Management Team, other State Department of Education staff members as deemed appropriate, and consultants from outside the Department who represent special areas of expertise in the areas of education of the gifted, parent education, and the like.

Experimental Programs for the Mentally Gifted

The new statewide thrust in gifted education will include experimental programs which discover, formulate, and field test procedures for identifying and developing potentialities of two groups of children and youth: (1) those who are educationally disadvantaged and culturally different; and (2) those who have extraordinary talent in creative production and leadership. Such programs would form the basis for providing appropriate differentiated activities, services, and special classes for presently unidentified and unserved gifted children and would provide the basis for future substantive program elements consistent with expanded definitions.

The Gifted and Talented Education Management Team will have the following as two of its high priorities: (1) the establishment of experimental programs for developing potentialities of disadvantaged children and youth who have been identified as gifted; and (2) the establishment of experimental programs for fostering extraordinary creativity and leadership skills of those identified with potential in either or both of these areas.

Educationally Disadvantaged Students

The rationale undergirding the need for experimental programs for educationally disadvantaged minors can be found in the references footnoted here[2] and in the following statement of the Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted:

> Sufficient fiscal support [should] be provided which would allow for complete rather than piecemeal or partial efforts, recognizing that additional funds may be required for identification of children from economically or impoverished backgrounds.

All of these references proclaim the necessity of identifying and making appropriate educational provisions available for culturally different, underachieving mentally gifted minors.

Under current interpretation of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title I, regulations, Title I funds are not used for developing programs for the gifted and talented within the disadvantaged population. This appears to give tacit acknowledgment to the claim that there is less than a normal distribution of talent and traits of the gifted within the disadvantaged population. It is, therefore, proposed that the Department seek reinterpretation of ESEA, Title I, regulations so that funds may be used specifically to develop the talented and gifted youth within the disadvantaged population.

Implementation of "Talent Search and Development." A first step in developing experimental programs for educationally disadvantaged students might be to implement major aspects of Article 7, "Talent Search and Development," sections 6499.21–6499.27 of the California Education Code (1971).[3] Identification procedures and instrumentalities could be designed and teaching and counseling procedures could be developed and perfected which raise aspiration levels and academic achievement of students identified as mentally gifted. This could be accomplished through establishing centers or through utilizing existing centers in districts which have initiated successful identification procedures and program elements for educationally disadvantaged, underachieving mentally gifted minors.

When appropriate, it is proposed that Title I, ESEA, and mentally gifted minor funds be used to carry out the intent of Article 7,

---

[2]House Committee Report 143 (1965) re: the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; California Assembly Bill 807 in 1968; Article 7, Talent Search and Development (sections 6499.21–6499.27), *Education Code* (1968–1971); Report of U.S. Commissioner Sidney Marland, Jr., to Congress, "Education of the Gifted and Talented" (1971).

[3]Because federal funds were not made available, the provisions set forth for these sections have been deleted from the Education Code.

"Talent Search and Development," of the Education Code through assessing and providing special educational activities for 1,000 educationally disadvantaged underachieving mentally gifted minors and through developing those identification, instructional, and counseling procedures and curricula which will raise academic achievement and levels of aspiration. Learning activities should be designed to enable these pupils "to achieve in their academic classes at levels commensurate with their individual abilities."

Program elements. Program elements to be considered, formulated, and tested in the experimental program for educationally disadvantaged students will contribute to and may be assessed by pupil progress and operational-administrative effectiveness.

Pupil-progress elements might include (1) cultural adequacy; (2) achievement in academic work; (3) self-esteem; (4) levels of aspiration (academic, career, other); (5) resourcefulness and adaptive flexibility; (6) creative production; (7) divergent thinking; (8) problem-solving ability; and (9) maturation.

Operational-administrative (program) elements will include (1) valid, reliable, and efficient instrumentalities, techniques, and procedures for identifying educationally disadvantaged, underachieving children as mentally gifted; (2) valid, reliable, and efficient instrumentalities, techniques, and procedures for assessing the intellectual potential of culturally different, underachieving students; (3) teaching strategies, learning activities, counseling, environments, and other factors which are used to raise levels of aspiration; (4) teaching strategies, learning activities, counseling, environments, and other factors which are used to raise the level of academic achievement; (5) coordination and direction of the program; (6) inservice education activities; (7) curriculum development; (8) scheduling of pupils and teachers; (9) use of community resources; (10) budgetary procedures; (11) procurement of materials; and (12) time accountability.

Application procedures. Through a system of competitive application procedures, districts with educationally disadvantaged, underachieving mentally gifted minors could submit program proposals which would accomplish the objectives of this experimental project and assess pupil progress and the operational-administrative elements listed in the preceding paragraph.

Criteria of pupil progress and operational-administrative effectiveness would be proposed by the applicant school districts and would be established in the final approval process with the assistance of the Department's Office of Program Evaluation and Research and with the assistance of the evaluation consultant who is to be a part of the Gifted and Talented Education Management Team.

If the mentally gifted minor program could be accommodated by the consolidated application (Form A-127), districts could be required to show in the needs assessment section a process by which the gifted will be identified, with subsections specifically outlining procedures to be used in schools receiving funds under ESEA, Title I, and Senate Bill 90. Schools applying for gifted programs would use the consolidated application for funding guaranteed at 3 percent of their a.d.a. Those districts wishing to identify and serve more than 3 percent of their a.d.a. would apply in the same manner as they would for expansion funds for the Early Childhood Education program. Objectives derived from the needs assessment should be developed, and an instructional program designed.

In permissive programs where funding is competitive (e.g., early childhood education), guidelines must specify arrangements for meeting the individual needs of the gifted, particularly those of gifted educationally disadvantaged youth.

Inservice education programs and instructions for the consolidated application form and other documents should direct attention to the following elements:

1. A clarification of the need for programs which are built upon the unique knowledges and understandings which students bring to school from the general culture as well as their specific subcultures
2. Program expectations which stress success rather than failure or even remediation
3. A description of ways to get and keep gifted educationally disadvantaged pupils in school long enough to attain optimum benefit from an appropriately different program

The Gifted and Talented Education Management Team will orient Department and school district personnel to the necessity of developing intellectual, academic, creative, and extraordinary leadership capabilities among gifted youth who are educationally disadvantaged—and to the importance of departmentwide cooperative efforts to accomplish this purpose.

Talent Development

Since 1961, California's mentally gifted minor program has been oriented mainly toward developing academic and higher intellectual competence. Recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee and current planning within the Department of Education seek to expand the mentally gifted minor program to include talent development. This expansion is consistent with recommendations in U.S. Commis-

sioner of Education Sidney Marland's Report to Congress in 1971 and with the federal Gifted and Talented Educational Assistance Act.

Talent may refer to a generalized perception of excellence, a dynamic system of relationships among behavioral traits and characteristics, or as strength in a particular behavioral trait or characteristic.

The talent development plan proposes to identify and formulate procedures for identifying and developing extraordinary talent in creative production, leadership, art, music, and drama. Reasons for establishing a talent development program are (1) to help develop fully those children who otherwise would receive no special instruction or guidance in improving their leadership, creative production, visual and performing arts, and psychomotor abilities; and (2) to bring the California program for gifted individuals closer to federal guidelines—guidelines which may become the basis for federal support.

Selection procedures. Nomination of candidates for a talented minors program should be made by teachers, principals, psychologists, counselors, and curriculum specialists. Selection might involve these same persons as well as representatives from art, music, cinematography, and humanities associations; and representatives from business, government, social, political, and educational agencies. Different clustering of selection committee members might be warranted when selecting children for different types of programs.

Committee members would review past achievements, including creative products, and other indices of extraordinary potential in creative production, leadership, art, music, and drama.

One thousand talented children, proportionally representing each of the five areas of talent and selected age or grade-level ranges, would be studied to determine characteristics and needs of these children and to determine the best possible educational programming for them, both within and outside the public school system.

Available instrumentalities, techniques, and procedures would be reviewed to determine their validity, reliability, and efficiency in identifying extraordinary potential in each of the five areas of talent. Eventually, new instruments might be designed and tested.

Program elements. Currently successful talent-development programs (including those in special schools, private and public, in California and other states) would be studied to ascertain their essential elements. Recommendations on programming would be sought from highly talented adults and from professional education associations representing areas of talent. Key elements replicable from other programs and conceptualized by extraordinarily talented

persons and professional educators would be formulated into experimental programs involving the 1,000 students.

Learning activities could include the following: (1) programmed attendance at and/or participation in art and music festivals and displays with assignments for appropriate follow-up activities; (2) participation in seminars on techniques of creative problem solving, small-group leadership, large-group leadership, communications, and psychological motivation; (3) dialogues with talented adult artists, painters, sculptors, musicians, architects, actors, and authors; (4) composition and production of original compositions in art, music, and drama; (5) multimedia productions; (6) contracts to do creative work; (7) courses in appreciation, history, theory, analysis, evaluation, and composition; and (8) regional meetings and work sessions on creative problem solving, art, music, humanities, leadership, and problems of state and local government; government intern programs; and scientific research.

The school districts chosen for the talent development experimental project would be selected by competitive application procedures in which the districts would complete the following steps:

1. Formulate behavioral objectives for the development of specific creative, leadership, visual-and-performing-arts, and psychomotor skills.
2. Describe qualitatively different and uniquely appropriate learning activities for developing these skills and for attaining objectives.
3. Provide a rationale for chosen objectives and activities.
4. Submit a plan containing procedures for (a) identifying extraordinarily talented individuals; (b) providing them with appropriate programs; and (c) evaluating pupil progress.
5. Submit plans for installing and institutionalizing talent development as described in "California Summer Honors Program." Such a program has

> . . . within it the potentiality for full development of human beings. Through a broad spectrum of creative and exploratory activities, dialogues with eminent persons, cultural events, and other summer program experiences, participants can gain a better understanding of the world in which they live and of themselves. They can acquire a foundation of thought and experience which will guide them toward joyful, productive, and meaningful living. They can become more rational and compassionate human beings.[4]

[4] Paul Plowman, "California Summer Honors Program" (Paper delivered October 20, 1972).

Part Two:
Report of the Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted

Philosophy

The Blue Ribbon Committee, recognizing the need for a philosophical basis for its deliberations and recommendations, developed the following statement of philosophy:

> The outreach of mankind requires perspectives which transcend eras and boundaries. These perspectives demand a recognition that human nature and human values are in a state of evolution. Formulations of the concepts needed to alter the direction of change require individuals who have outstanding abilities and who are committed to the highest moral and ethical principles. In this role as concept formulator, such individuals have unique responsibility for contributing to viable alternatives which not only effect social change but also provide a base of social stability.
>
> In turn, society must make a commitment to provide opportunities for the maximum development of individual potential. This potential can be realized only if the institutions of society provide differentiated opportunities for learning. The schools in particular have a fundamental obligation to facilitate the means for identifying and nurturing individuals with outstanding abilities.
>
> It must be emphasized that extraordinary abilities and talents are found in all segments of society. Therefore, the identification of each gifted individual must be made as early as possible; the identification process must be multidimensional, and it should concentrate on the many expressions of exceptionality. Implicit in the foregoing statement is the expectation that the school, in concert with the community, will design and implement appropriate programs to meet individual needs. Such programs should provide for alternatives so that individuals with outstanding abilities will have a maximum opportunity to explore various facets of their talents and will be able to choose which of these talents to develop. Differentiated educational opportunity should be a continuing process which entails national priority, state commitment, and local responsibility.

Definition

The Blue Ribbon Committee developed the following definition, based on the philosophical statement in the preceding section, to

assist in the identification of individuals with outstanding abilities:

> Gifted individuals are those who demonstrate outstanding capacities and/or potential to excel within their environment in one or more of the following areas: intellectual abilities, leadership skills, creative production.

Goals

The Blue Ribbon Committee agreed on four priority program goals for gifted education. The goals, emphasizing opportunities for the development of maximum potential for individuals with outstanding abilities regardless of program design, are as follows:

- To provide differentiated opportunities for learning commensurate with the gifted individual's particular abilities and talents
- To provide alternative learning environments where gifted individuals can acquire the skills and understandings at advanced ideological and creative levels commensurate with their potential
- To help the gifted develop empathy for, sensitivity to, and responsibility toward others and a commitment to constructive ethical standards
- To assist the gifted to develop self-generating problem-solving abilities in order to expand each person's awareness of choices for satisfying contributions in his or her environment

Needs

Recognizing that all individuals have certain basic needs, the Blue Ribbon Committee identified the following five needs as especially relevant to the gifted:

- Recognition, understanding, and acceptance of giftedness by community, parent, educator, and peer
- Differentiated and multiple learning options
- Help in learning to understand their extraordinary capabilities and the possible effect of their potential on others
- Opportunity and encouragement to develop a positive self-image, leadership ability, and creativity; and the encouragement necessary to make appropriate career choices
- Encouragement to develop fully their high potential through supportive and facilitating adult influence

Program Principles

To meet the goals for the education of individuals with outstanding abilities, the Blue Ribbon Committee stressed that the gifted are entitled to a meaningful and complete educational experience

regardless of age, location, ethnic background, or economic circumstance. It is particularly important that the nation and the state help develop this human resource, the gifted.

Program development for gifted education should proceed with appropriate attention to the program principles which follow. The 15 principles are listed within three clusters: counseling and guidance; curriculum and instruction; and staff development.

Counseling and Guidance

1. Early identification and continuous screening
2. Labeling
3. Guidance
4. Student involvement
5. Career awareness

Curriculum and Instruction

6. Programs for every mentally gifted minor
7. Cooperative community involvement—planning and evaluation
8. Qualitatively different and individualized instruction
9. Flexibility
10. Attention to cognitive and affective domains
11. Basic skills
12. Association with peers

Staff Development

13. Staffing
14. Preservice and inservice education
15. Incentives

Program development which incorporates the 15 program principles will reduce the possibility of some gifted students reacting negatively toward peers, teachers, and society, thereby developing generalized hostility toward learning and possibly withdrawing from school.

Program Recommendations

In order to accomplish the program goals consistent with the principles listed in the preceding section, the Blue Ribbon Committee made the following general and specific recommendations:[1]

General Recommendations

A. Programs be mandated for all gifted minors.

[1] For a graphic representation of how these recommendations relate to the 15 program principles, refer to Figure 1.

B. Special and/or individualized programs for the gifted be established with student evaluation systems (marking, grading) which do not penalize the gifted but which challenge the student.
C. All programs for the gifted provide opportunities for appropriate recognition of various talents, abilities, and needs.
D. A continuous process of internal evaluation to assess effectiveness be incorporated in all programs.
E. When programs are established, they include an option for individualized instruction.
F. In districts which have programs for the gifted, parents of the gifted be represented on both district and local parent advisory committees and be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the gifted programs.
G. School districts be authorized to contract for individualized special education experiences out of their districts.
H. Every gifted student and his or her parents/guardian have opportunities to decide whether or not the student will participate in a special program or in any of the available alternatives.
I. All personnel employed in programs for the gifted have opportunities for specialized training, including preservice and inservice education.
J. Every district with a gifted program have a committed ombudsman (volunteer or employed); a district with more than 600 gifted individuals employ a full-time credentialed coordinator and one consultant for each additional 600 gifted.
K. Legislative provision be made for school districts to request the State Board of Education for waivers of Education Code sections which inhibit implementation of special programs and learning options for the gifted.
L. A separate foundation be established to supplement the State Merit Scholarship Program. Individuals and corporations could contribute funds to this foundation to provide higher education for gifted students who do not qualify for the merit system funds. This would provide recognition and/or an incentive for those who have participated in a gifted program in elementary and/or high school and would help to ensure that this talent is not lost.

Specific Recommendations to State Department of Education

M. Sufficient fiscal support be provided which would allow for complete rather than piecemeal or partial efforts, recognizing that additional funds may be required for identification of

children from economically impoverished or divergent backgrounds.

N. Funds be available to provide additional full-time state consultants to serve and monitor the gifted program and to provide for special resource personnel, preservice and inservice programs, appropriate evaluation, and research.

O. Regional training workshops be provided by the State Department of Education for those administering, coordinating, and conducting programs for the gifted.

P. A relationship be developed with the University of California, the Chancellor's office of the California State University and Colleges, and private postsecondary institutions in the interest of the gifted which will ensure the provision of special educational experiences in the colleges and universities for those not yet enrolled as regular students.

Q. A request be initiated to the University of California's Articulation Conference (in which all levels of higher education are represented) for a representative for the gifted and a special section in the conference to address itself to the needs of the gifted in California's institutions of higher education.

R. Research be conducted to provide additional information about how the gifted learn with implications for how educational institutions can best serve them, and comparative research be conducted to determine the relative effectiveness of various programmatic approaches to educating individuals with outstanding abilities.

S. Opportunities be provided for showcasing talents.

T. Appropriate staffing ratios be considered in relationship to program needs for the gifted.

U. Opportunities be provided for gifted individuals to participate in experiences and to take risks not usually available to or understood by the average person while accepting responsibility for the results of the actions and decisions which are often unique.

V. Counseling be available for parents and others involved in child care regarding the needs and nurture of the gifted.

W. School districts be required to make every effort to ensure that the identified gifted population is representative of the socioeconomic and ethnic composition of the district population.

X. School districts in no case be allowed to delete provisions for pupils with an IQ of 140 or higher on a standardized individual examination.

Figure 1—Cross-reference grid showing relationship of program principles and program recommendations for education of gifted individuals in California

Program recommendations	Program principles: Early identification 1	Labeling 2	Counseling 3	Student involvement 4	Career awareness 5	Mandated programs 6	Community involvement 7	Qualitative difference 8	Flexibility 9	Cognitive and affective 10	Basic skill development 11	Association with peers 12	Staffing 13	Staff development 14	Incentives 15
A. Mandated programs	x					x									
B. Individualized programs								x	x						
C. Recognition of talents, abilities, and needs					x	x	x	x		x		x			x
D. Continuous evaluation			x	x			x				x				
E. Individualized instruction								x	x		x				
F. Parent involvement		x	x	x			x								
G. Individualized experiences out of district						x	x	x	x		x				
H. Option to participate			x	x			x		x						
I. Specialized training for staff		x											x	x	
J. Ombudsman, coordinator			x				x						x		

K. Waivers of Education Code							x	x	x		x		x		
L. State Merit Scholarship program				x			x	x	x						x
M. Fiscal support	x		x			x		x					x		x
N. Funding for staff needs evaluation, and research							x	x					x	x	
O. Regional training workshop								x					x	x	x
P. College experience for gifted							x	x	x						x
Q. Representative of gifted to Articulation Conference														x	x
R. Research on how gifted learn and relative programming								x		x					
S. Showcasing talents								x		x					x
T. Staffing ratios			x					x					x		
U. Risk-taking experiences								x	x						x
V. Counseling for parents	x	x	x				x								
W. Socioeconomic and ethnic representation	x						x							x	x
X. Provision above 140 IQ	x		x			x		x							x
Y. Preservice and inservice education														x	

Y. Preservice and inservice training be provided for teachers, administrators, consultants, and counselors of gifted individuals. (These staff members require specific preservice and inservice education which prepares them to function effectively in the development of higher intellectual, academic, affective, and creative skills. Inservice education should prepare staff in pupil-appraisal, program planning and development, and evaluation. The selected techniques can be appropriately differentiated through staff training programs in which staff members can acquire a thorough understanding of the characteristics of the gifted, their learning and developmental needs, and appropriate teaching methodologies for use with gifted students.)

Appendix

Members, Blue Ribbon Committee for Education of the Gifted

Allyn E. Arnold (Chairman), Coordinator, Programs for the Gifted, Los Angeles Unified School District

Margaret Pardee Bates, Parent, Carmel

Robert Fuchigami, Dean of Graduate Studies, California State College, Sonoma

Imogene (Teddy) Hill, Teacher, Del Dayo Elementary School, San Juan Unified School District, Carmichael

Richard R. Jackson, Principal, Crawford Senior High School, San Diego City Unified School District

Beverly King, Executive Director, California Parents for the Gifted, Woodland Hills

Samuel Levine, Professor of Education and Psychology, School of Education, San Francisco State University

Ruth Martinson, Professor Emeritus of Education and Psychology, California State College, Dominguez Hills

Bill R. Plaster, Superintendent, Upland Elementary School District

Robert Ponce, Director of Secondary Education, Office of Ventura County Superintendent of Schools

Mabel C. Purl, Director, Research and Evaluation, Riverside Unified School District

Avis Snyder, Assistant Principal, Woodcrest Special Education Unit, Fullerton Elementary School District

Clifford J. Stallings, Jr., Associate Professor, Graduate School of Human Behavior, United States International University, San Diego; and Consultant, Center of Urban and Human Development

Harriet Williams, Parent, Long Beach; and Member, Commission on Special Education

State Board of Education Representative

Marion W. (Joy) Drinker, Saratoga

Note: The positions of the persons listed on pages 31 and 32 are those held at the time the committees submitted their reports.

State Department of Education Staff to Blue Ribbon Committee

Executive Secretary to Committee

Marshall Fels, Consultant, Office of Program Evaluation and Research

Recording Secretary

Rose Marie Farnsworth, Office of Program Evaluation and Research

*Sieg Efken, Consultant, Office of Program Planning and Development

†Jack Mosier, Consultant, Mentally Gifted Minor Program, Bureau of Mentally Exceptional Children, Special Education Support Unit

Jeanada Nolan, Assistant to Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction, Early Childhood Education

†Paul Plowman, Consultant, Mentally Gifted Minor Program, Bureau of Mentally Exceptional Children, Special Education Support Unit

Members, State Department of Education Planning Team on Gifted Education

Chairman

*Sieg Efken, Consultant, Office of Program Planning and Development

Vincent Bello, Consultant, Bilingual-Bicultural Task Force

Leslie Brinegar, Associate Superintendent and Manager, Special Education Support Unit

Diane Carey, Health Care Leader, General Education Support Unit

Marcelett Henry, Consultant, Office of Program Planning and Development

Harvey Hunt, Consultant, Special Projects Office

William Merz, Consultant, Office of Program Evaluation and Research

†Jack Mosier, Consultant, Mentally Gifted Minor Program, Bureau of Mentally Exceptional Children, Special Education Support Unit

Jeanada Nolan, Assistant to the Program Manager, Early Childhood Education

Karen Olsen, Assistant, Early Childhood Education Management Team

†Paul Plowman, Consultant, Mentally Gifted Minor Program, Bureau of Mentally Exceptional Children, Special Education Support Unit

Elizabeth Richland, Consultant, Compensatory Education Support Unit

---

*Now Manager, Gifted and Talented Education Management Team

†Now Consultant, Gifted and Talented Education Management Team

74-18 03-0696 6-75 3M